REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-27 remain in the application.

Allowable claims

Claims 4-7, 13-16, and 22-25 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Section 103 rejections

Claims 1-3, 8-12, 17-21, 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Stanfill et al. (US 5,819,021) and in view of McLain et al. (US 6,295,518).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection with respect to the claims in issue.

The Action asserts that "Stanfill substantially teaches a method for producing a parallel computation based on such analysis". Stanfill (assigned to the assignee of the present invention) does teach methods for partitioning data (not scripts) into smaller data sets so that checkpoints (i.e., saving computation state) can be done more frequently than in prior art. While this is an inventive way of splitting data up, it has nothing to do with parallelizing a computer application program based on a script of a script-driven software tool. Indeed, there is no mention of "script" in the Stanfill patent. Simply put, there is no teaching or suggestion in Stanfill about analyzing (automatically or not) a script (or any equivalent of a script) or producing a parallel computation specification (an actual output, not just a desired result) based on such analysis, where such parallel computation specification provides functional equivalence to the script when executed by a parallel runtime system (see claim 1 and counterpart claims).

McLain is not relevant art. McLain teaches "a system, method and computer program product for emulating a telecommunications network ... [which] includes ... a script interpreter for executing scripts, a script database containing data from actual network devices for use by the scripts, ... The system provides both script and non-script responses to a control system in order to emulate digital matrix switches. Script responses preferably work in conjunction with

databases that contain data from actual network devices and data provided by control systems to generate more realistic responses" (McLain, Abstract). The description in cols. 3 and 10 of McLain cited by the Examiner simply describes how a script interpreter 218 works in executing the steps of a particular script. The scripts described by McLain are an example of a scripting language suited for a particular need, as are the examples given in the present application (i.e., SAS scripts and Syncsort scripts).

Thus, McLain teaches an application in which scripts are used. However, significantly, McLain contains no teaching or suggestion about analyzing a script (or any equivalent of a script) to produce a parallel computation specification based on such analysis, where such parallel computation specification provides functional equivalence to the script when executed by a parallel runtime system.

Consider exemplary independent claim 1, which recites in relevant part:

"...automatically analyzing the script and producing a parallel computation specification based on such analysis, where such parallel computation specification provides functional equivalence to the script when executed by a parallel runtime system."

Neither Stanfill nor McLain teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, analyzing a script (or any equivalent of a script) to produce a parallel computation specification based on such analysis. The same argument applies with respect to the remaining rejected claims (many of which also distinguish from the cited references by the addition of additional limitations not taught or suggested by such references), as do the additional arguments set forth in response to the previous Office Action (not repeated here for the sake of brevity). Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the references, alone or in combination, anticipate or make obvious the invention as presently claimed. Applicant submits that this case is now in condition for allowance.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Enclosed is a $460 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: OCT 18, 2002

Kenyon S. Jenckes
Reg. No. 41,873

PTO Customer No. 20985
Fish & Richardson P.C.
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500
San Diego, California 92122
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099

10222927.doc